

REMARKS

Claims 60-72 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 43-59 are canceled and claims 60-72 are added. No new matter is added by this Amendment.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 43-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 43-54 are canceled. Thus, this rejection is moot.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 43-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,531,191 (Notenboom). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 43-55 are canceled. Thus, with respect to these claims, this rejection is moot.

Newly added claims 60-72 are not obvious in view of AAPA and Notenboom.

Noteboom discloses that a ceramic layer 7, a ceramic layer 9, and a ceramic layer 11 form one functional film. The ceramic layers are individually dried and fired. Accordingly, Notenboom requires nine steps in total: a coating step, a drying step, and a firing step for each of the ceramic layer 7, the ceramic layer 9, and the ceramic layer 11.

Meanwhile, according to the present claims, only five steps are required: a coating step for applying a first droplet and a second droplet, a drying step, a coating step for applying a third droplet, and a drying step, and a step for collectively firing these droplets.

Accordingly, the present claims make it possible to form a wiring substrate much more easily than the method disclosed in Notenboom.

For at least the foregoing reasons, AAPA and Notenboom fail to render obvious the features of independent claims 60 and 71.

Furthermore, according to at least claim 60, a third droplet is applied without a first droplet and a second droplet being fired, thereby enhancing the adhesion of the particles contained in these three droplets. Collective firing of all these droplets enhances the bonding power of the particles. As explained above, in order to collectively fire them, it is necessary to form a dried functional liquid pattern. However, repetition of only the coating could not lead to the successful formation of a function liquid pattern because the adjacent droplets coagulate, forming a large pool. Meanwhile, the repetition of coating and drying for each droplet will increase the number of steps.

However, the presently claimed features make it possible to successfully form a functional liquid pattern with a fewer steps, by depositing a first droplet and a second droplet so that they are not in contact with each other, and drying them, and then depositing a third droplet between them.

For the foregoing reasons, AAPA, alone or together with Notenboom, fail to anticipate or render obvious the features of claims 60 and 71, as well as claims depending therefrom.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel

Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/eks

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: November 15, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461